



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on August 8, 2016

Published in the August 8, 2016 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 15

Correction, Please!

Campaign Against Climate-change Skeptics

Item: *The Obama White House, on its official website, touts the president's "Historic Commitment to Protecting the Environment and Reversing Climate Change." The White House website also cites the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's assertion that "2014 was the hottest year on record globally, and 2015 is on track to break that record." The president, we are assured, "believes that no challenge poses a greater threat to our children, our planet, and future generations than climate change."*

Among the many actions taken toward that "solution" — which largely involve imposing more regulations and spending federal monies — has been the president's push for the Clean Power Act and the Paris Agreement, the latter being signed in April 2016. The site notes, "After years of hard work, and thanks to principled American leadership — more than 190 countries came together to adopt the most ambitious climate change agreement in history."

Item: *The website for Democrat presidential candidate Hillary Clinton carries a litany of her promises and commitments — including "meeting the climate challenge." We are also informed that "2015 was the warmest year on record."*

The campaign page further tells us: "Climate change is an urgent threat and a defining challenge of our time — and Hillary Clinton has a plan to tackle it by making America the world's clean energy superpower, taking bold steps to slash carbon pollution at home and around the world, and ensuring no Americans are left out or left behind as we rapidly build a clean energy economy."

Moreover, "Hillary's plan is designed to deliver on the pledge President Obama made at the Paris climate conference last December — without relying on climate deniers in Congress to pass new legislation."

Correction: It would seem that extremism in the defense of extremism is not an extreme position. That's good to know.

Of course, neither the present nor would-be chief executive is going to repeal the laws of nature. The climate is always changing. Still, it would be helpful if Clinton and her supporters learned the difference between climate and weather: Her campaign website says climate change is real because people have seen "flooded streets of Miami and Annapolis," for example. Will floods be outlawed? Will climate stasis — presumably what happens when climate change is reversed — be mandatory?

The measurements needed for the Earth's temperature are complicated and they have been widely misused and misreported. Indeed, even NOAA eventually admitted (quietly and in what might be called the fine print) that the "hottest year on record" claim for 2014 was based on an apparent increase that was within the margin of error of the thermometer.

Roy Spencer, a meteorologist and principal research scientist at the University of Alabama in Huntsville, has stressed repeatedly: As the "continual fiddling with the global surface thermometer data leads to an ever-warmer present and an ever-cooler past, many of us are increasingly skeptical that beating a previous 'warmest' year by hundredths of a degree has any real-world meaning."



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on August 8, 2016

Published in the August 8, 2016 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 15

And when one looks at the satellite data, what is seen is a “pause” lasting almost two decades — which is one reason why “global warming” is not used by activists so often these days. Writing about such measurements in the blog “Power Line,” John Haderaker noted last year:

Contrary to the activists’ claims, 2014 wasn’t even the warmest recent year. The “warmest ever” designation came from NASA and NOAA, which are run by global warming activists. They have distorted surface temperature records by surreptitiously “adjusting” historical records to make the past (e.g., the 1930s) look cooler and the present warmer. This is one of the great scandals in the history of science, which we have written about repeatedly. Since the activists won’t say what changes they have made and why they have made them, their records must be considered hopelessly corrupt.

On the other hand, they haven’t made the one obvious adjustment that should be made, by accounting for the urban heat island effect, which obviously exists. Most temperature recording stations are in urban areas, and they have gotten warmer in recent decades as a result of economic development and population growth, not carbon dioxide.

Haderaker, who is a lawyer by trade, went on to say: “The only global temperature records that are fully transparent are satellite records in the lower atmosphere. These go back only to 1979. They show no warming during the last 18 years. The satellite records, interpreted by two different groups, find 2014 to be either the third warmest or the sixth warmest since 1979. But the real point is that the differences are infinitesimal. The uncorrupted atmospheric data show that no significant warming is going on.”

Meanwhile, as noted in a piece in the *Wall Street Journal*, Gina McCarthy, the president’s administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, would not, despite being asked repeatedly, explain to legislators exactly how much the Paris Agreement would cut global temperatures.

What is known is that we will pay for it. Dearly.

Bjørn Lomborg, who has written widely on this general issue, is more forthcoming in a *Wall Street Journal* article:

The Paris Agreement will cost a fortune but do little to reduce global warming. In a peer-reviewed article published in *Global Policy* this year, I looked at the widely hailed major policies that Paris Agreement signatories pledged to undertake and found that they will have a negligible temperature impact. I used the same climate-prediction model that the United Nations uses.

... Consider the Obama administration’s signature climate policy, the Clean Power Plan. The U.N.’s model shows that it will accomplish almost nothing. Even if the policy withstands current legal challenges and its cuts are totally implemented — not for the 14 years that the Paris agreement lasts, but for the rest of the century — the Clean Power Plan would reduce temperatures by 0.023 degrees Fahrenheit by 2100.

Lomborg, the president of the Copenhagen Center, pointed out in his recent *Journal* article that the costs of the Paris climate pact “are likely to run to \$1 trillion to \$2 trillion annually throughout the rest of the century, using the best estimates from the Stanford Energy Modeling Forum and the Asia Modeling Exercise. Spending more than \$100 trillion for such a feeble temperature reduction by the end of the century does not make sense.”

The Obama administration has also been abusing executive authority by pushing through extreme



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on August 8, 2016

Published in the August 8, 2016 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 15

policies without congressional approval. Hillary Clinton says she will do that and more to defeat the “deniers,” i.e., the elected representatives who don’t salaam themselves before the altar of the government-approved “science.”

The White House used the participation of the United States in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, or UNFCCC — which dates to the last century — to work around, unconstitutionally, the Senate’s advice-and-consent obligation over what was effectively a treaty.

This power play was reported, rather casually, by the *New York Times* in August of 2016. The *Times* explained that “to go around Congress to push his international climate change agenda, Mr. Obama is echoing his domestic climate strategy. In June, he bypassed Congress and used his executive authority to order a far-reaching regulation forcing American coal-fired power plants to curb their carbon emissions.”

While most Americans don’t even know the UNFCCC exists, it represents a key threat, economically and politically.

The international body that has grown up along with the convention believes that the use of fossil fuels must be slashed to reduce “global warming.” The Obama administration is doing just that. As noted by Nicolas Loris and Brett Schaefer, energy and regulatory experts with the Heritage Foundation, this has led to regulations that “severely [restrict] the use of coal and, to a lesser extent, oil and natural gas.” As they put it in a briefing in June:

Since these fuels supply the vast majority of America’s energy, these regulations will dramatically increase energy costs, stunt economic growth and force businesses to shed jobs. Yet the effect on global temperatures will be virtually nonexistent.

The UNFCCC approach is unworkable largely because it places the economic burden of addressing climate change on a few dozen developed countries while asking little or nothing from more the 150 developing countries. Yet the primary source of emissions is increasingly the developing world, most notably China and India. Though some developing countries have pledged to start restricting carbon dioxide emissions more than a decade from now, these commitments have largely been talk with little action.

For years, the scare-mongers have tried to frighten us to give up our freedoms because of the supposed threats that might accompany certain economic developments. The same ploy is still being employed, even though the old scares proved fraudulent. In 2005, point out Loris and Schaefer,

The U.N. Environment Program estimated that global warming would create 50 million “climate refugees” by 2010. In 2009 Al Gore predicted that the Arctic polar ice cap could be ice-free within seven years. The amount of warming predicted by climate models used by the U.N.’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change hasn’t occurred. If these models can’t predict climate impacts 10 or 15 years in the future, why should we undertake costly, anti-development policies to address predictions about what may happen 100 years from now?

In reality, the UNFCCC has little to do with combatting man-made warming and more to do with engineering fundamental economic change. Earlier this year, former UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres made this agenda clear: “This is the first time in the history of mankind that we are setting ourselves the task of intentionally, within a defined period of time, to change the economic



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on August 8, 2016

Published in the August 8, 2016 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 15

development model that has been reigning for at least 150 years, since the Industrial Revolution.”

If you don't buy into the progressive agenda — which includes using government force to promote and subsidize energy generated by solar, wind, and biofuels sources — you face the possibility of becoming an enemy of the state. Literally.

The Obama Department of Justice has even been “considering” prosecuting those charged with being climate-change deniers, as admitted by Attorney General Loretta Lynch at a Senate Judiciary hearing earlier this year. Racketeering laws would be the vehicle. Similarly, various state Democratic attorneys general have moved to investigate companies that might dare make donations to groups or fund research by individuals who don't believe in “climate change,” as if it were the state religion.

In this instance, the state attackers largely had Exxon Mobil in their sights. Yet, the First Amendment and conservative and libertarian groups were also bound to suffer collateral damage.

The Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI), based in Washington, D.C., responded to the subpoena from Virgin Islands Attorney General Claude Walker, noting that it attempted “to unearth a decade of the organization's materials and work on climate change policy.” The subpoena “requests a decade's worth of communications, emails, statements, drafts, and other documents regarding CEI's work on climate change and energy policy, including private donor information,” the institute said.

As the CEI put it: “This is the latest effort in an intimidation campaign to criminalize speech and research on the climate debate, led by New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman and former Vice President Al Gore.”

Under public fire, Walker withdrew his Exxon subpoena. This came shortly after the CEI said it was seeking sanctions against the Virgin Islands attorney general. Sam Kazman, CEI's general counsel, said Walker's subpoena was an attempt to “shut down debate” on climate change.

This is not an isolated incident. So-called progressives continue to use the force and threat of law to get their way, and only their way, in universities and with city policies, for example.

U.S. Attorney General Lynch informed a congressional hearing that she had ordered “the FBI to look into this question of climate ‘fraud.’” The problem is not, as Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama and so many of their “progressive” allies would have us believe, “unchecked climate change.” A far greater threat comes from unchecked government power. And in that arena, the ultimate target is our liberties.

— William P. Hoar



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on August 8, 2016

Published in the August 8, 2016 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 15

Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.